DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 141 AC 006 108

AUTHOR	Cullinan, Bernice E.; Ferber, Zelda
TITLE	The Sarah Lawrence-New York University Teacher Education Program, 1963-1969; An Evaluative Profile.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y.
PUB DATE	Aug 69
NOTE	54p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.80
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum, Educational Objectives, *Elementary School Teachers, *Experimental Programs, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, Participant Characteristics, Program Evaluation, *Teacher Education, *Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS	New York University, *Sarah Lawrence College

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the effectiveness of a teacher education program for mature women cooperatively planned and conducted by Sarah Lawrence College and New York University. Program goals as identified by the two institutions, participating students, and society served as criterion measures. Necessary data were collected by interview, questionnaire, examination of records, and observation. The program was a model for a number of teacher education programs in other institutions, and produced a small group of teachers rated as superior by their instructors and employers. It reached a previously untapped supply of highly qualified potential teachers. Participants rated the program as valuable and appropriate for mature women with reduced child rearing and homemaking demands. Although innovative in various ways (mainly by its course in the analytical study of teaching), it did not completely fulfill the original aim of radical experimentation. The underlying philosophy proved a worthwhile means of developing superior elementary school teachers, and recommendations for continuation and expansion were made. (author/ly)

ED034141

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE SARAH LAWRENCE - NEW YORK UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM: 1963-1969

AN EVALUATIVE PROFILE

Bernice E. Cullinan
Associate Professor
New York University

Zelda Ferber
Evaluation Consultant

New York University

August, 1969

A600 6108

ED034141

THE SARAH LAWRENCE - NEW YORK UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM: 1963-1969

AN EVALUATIVE PROFILE

Bernice E. Cullinan
Associate Professor
New York University

Zelda Ferber
Evaluation Consultant

New York University

August, 1969

THE SARAH LAWRENCE -

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	
Development of the program	1
Goals for the program	2
Description of the Sarah Lawrence Center and NYU	5
Recruitment and selection of students	6
Description of students	7
Description of program	10
Evaluation of the Sarah Lawrence - New York University Teacher Education Program	
Procedures used in this study	18
Summary of responses by staff	19
Summary of responses by students	20
Summary of responses by administrators	27
Summary of responses by principals	28
Description of other programs	28
Summary of Evaluation	29
Recommendations	
Recruitment and selection	30
Program	30
Appendices	
A Evaluation form completed by students in 1965, 1966, 1967.	32
B Pilot and final questionnaire form for students	34
C Questionnaire for staff	37
D Questionnaire for principals	40
E Questionnaires from Sarah Lawrence Center	42
F Publicity releases from Sarah Lawrence Center	48
G Other programs in the area	50

INTRODUCTION

Development of the program

Continuing education for women had been a growing national interest when the movement was given a great thrust forward by Esther Rauschenbush of Sarah Lawrence College. In 1962, she founded the Center for Continuing Education in Bronxville, New York. The Center was established primarily to assist women in the Westchester area who wanted to continue their education which had been interrupted by years of total absorption with child rearing and home making. During the first year of operation, the Center was concerned with women who had not completed their baccalaureate degree, but inquiries were made by a large group of women with Bachelor's degrees who also wanted to continue their education. It was during the first year of operation that Mrs. Rauschenbush laid the groundwork for affiliations with other institutions offering graduate degrees that led to the teacher education program with New York University.

A union between a good liberal arts college and several graduate professional schools seemed a desirable commitment to Mrs. Rauschenbush. She believed that two institutions working together could accomplish results neither could achieve alone. This belief prompted discussions with Dean John Payne of the School of Education of New York University as well as exchange of ideas with leaders at Pratt Institute and the New York University School of Social Work. Mrs. Rauschenbush's goals for the relationship between Sarah Lawrence and New York University School of Education included a cooperative program that had a strong experimental base. The history of Sarah Lawrence as an experimental college prompted her to envision the development of a small, exciting and unique approach to the preparation of elementary school teachers. She believed that this program could serve as something of a model for other institutions across the country and could be used to test radically different approaches to the preparation of teachers. There was a strong feeling among the initial staff that this program was not to duplicate an existing New York University program, nor was it to become an extension program. Rather, cooperative planning and control would produce new and exploratory approaches to the preparation of elementary school teachers.

The Center for Continuing Education at Sarah Lawrence had been founded on unique and non-traditional premises. Initially it was specified that only women who had been out of school more than five years would be accepted. It was considered an advantage to have been out of college for more than ten years and eventually women who had been out of school for twenty years were attracted into the program. The expressed intent for the Center's program was to reach women who were entering a period of life when child rearing and family demands had lessened. The belief that mature women could make a significant contribution to society through any number of professions guided the development of the Center and its programs. After contact with a number of students who could devote only part-time to the continuation of their studies, Mrs. Rauschenbush said, "We learned very early that part-time study did not mean part-time motivation."

A survey of community interests and community needs was taken by the staff as they assessed directions for the Center's programs. They found that there were 170 public elementary schools staffed by 3800 teachers in Westchester County. While they did not find a shortage of teachers in the area, they heard frequent reports that there was need for additional highly qualified and effective teachers. Several reports from school personnel in nearby low socioeconomic areas specified a need for highly qualified teachers with a strong social service commitment. Therefore, one of the programs to be developed, and the one that is the subject for this evaluation, was the teacher education program developed cooperatively by New York University and Sarah Lawrence College.

The resultant program in graduate professional education that was developed started in 1963. It was conducted under the direction of New York University's Division of Early Childhood and Elementary Education and led to a Master of Arts degree. The program fulfilled all of the requirements for state certification for teaching in public elementary schools. New York University had been involved in similar programs and had in operation a part-time pre-service program that led to a Master's degree. By making some modifications in the program, by utilizing classroom space at the Sarah Lawrence campus, and by establishing field work relationships with schools in the Westchester area the program was initiated for thirteen women in the fall of 1963. Since its inception, the program has enrolled 82 women, more than half of whom have graduated while 26 are in the final stages of the program.

Three supporting grants were made by the Carnegie Foundation toward the "seeding" nature of this program. One grant was made in 1962 to establish the Center, one in 1964 to maintain and support the exploration of programs with other graduate institutions, and one in 1966 awarded jointly to Pratt Institute, New York University and Sarah Lawrence College to support the graduate programs and to make loans available to the students. The scholarship and loan fund, administered by the Sarah Lawrence Center, was an attempt to make the program available to women who were qualified for the program but were not financially able to take advantage of it. Although the fund was intended for, and used primarily by undergraduate students, a limited amount was also available for part-time graduate women. The last of these Carnegie grants terminated in August, 1969.

Goals for the program

The objectives of the New York University-Sarah Lawrence program may be expressed in several ways. They are discussed here in terms of the institutions, the students involved, and contributions to society or more specifically, the profession.

Institutional goals. Although expressed in somewhat different terms, the goals of the Sarah Lawrence staff and the representatives of New York University were very similar. Indeed, both institutions sought:

a) to attempt a unique approach to the preparation of elementary school teachers;

b) to attract a body of potential teachers from a previously untapped source;

c) to provide a different type of educational experience for women returning to study after a long absence; and

d) to demonstrate the feasibility of part-time programs of an experimental nature for mature women so that other institutions might consider similar programs.

Student goals. Understandably, goals expressed by the students often reflected those of the institutions and those of society, since these particular women had a commitment to society and were attempting to improve their skills to make a contribution to societal needs. The following goals were expressed implicitly and explicitly by women in the participating groups. They sought:

a) to improve their personal skills in order to make a more significant contribution to society than they were presently capable of doing;

b) to use the years after the intense demands of child rearing had passed working toward worthwhile pursuits;

c) to remain intellectually alert and to keep abreast of new trends in education;

d) to be involved in their own educational endeavor and not just observers of their children's or husband's world;

e) to combine the lessened demands of home making with challenging part-time activities outside the home; and

f) to complete a graduate degree program.

Societal goals. Societal goals are seldom expressed in explicit statements. In this instance, the expression came chiefly from representatives of the education profession. Principals and teachers who worked in the New York University-Sarah Lawrence program had purposes of their own for participating and helping the program to succeed. Namely, the principals and teachers involved wished:

a) to increase the number of highly qualified and capable teachers;

b) to attract a group of potentially good candidates to the teaching profession;

c) to develop cooperation between public schools and universities in planning a valuable program of teacher education; and

d) to utilize the experiences and cultural background of an unusual group of mature women.

This document reports the extent to which these goals were achieved. A brief description of the Sarah Lawrence Center for Continuing Education and the New York University School of Education is given in the next part with procedures for recruitment and selection of students in the following pages. The students selected for this experimental program in teacher education were drawn from a population different from other groups of graduate students. Information about these students is provided after the criteria for selection. Immediately following the description of the students is a description of the program in which they participated. Although no program can be described adequately by a listing of course titles, it does provide the broad outlines of the program.

The major section of this report gives an account of the evaluation procedures used for this study and reports the data collected. Reports from staff, students, administrators, and public school principals are included. A description of other programs in the area, a summary and recommendations complete the report.

Description of the Sarah Lawrence Center for Continuing Education and the New York University School of Education

The setting of the two institutions involved in the partnership of a teacher education program could hardly have been more diverse. The quarters for the Westchester-based phases of the program were provided in the Sarah Lawrence Center for Continuing Education, which is housed in a restored carriage house. The attractive, ivy-covered building located on a rolling estate contrasts sharply with the inner city location of the New York University School of Education at Washington Square. The environment of the city with its demands for appropriate dress were not as appealing to the participants as the more informal suburban surroundings. Perhaps the physical environment and the proximity to their homes accounted for the students' repeated preference to have the entire program located at the Sarah Lawrence Center or in one of the Westchester public schools. These environmental factors plus the two or three hour commutation to Washington Square undoubtedly influenced this preference.

Classrooms provided in the Center for Continuing Education are generally well-appointed. Small meeting rooms furnished with attractive chairs and tables and windows overlooking flower gardens suggest a pleasant learning environment. One room with a huge oval table actually determined the number of women who could be enrolled in the program. Since there were exactly 17 spaces at the table, with space for an instructor or two, class groups were limited to 17 women. Provision for coffee and cookies added to the sociability and relaxed atmosphere of studying at the Center.

The requirement to have part of the graduate study located on the New York University campus was theoretically sound but impracticable. That is, the Sarah Lawrence group of graduate students was not to be treated any differently from other students in terms of university demands and requirements. Furthermore, it was believed that they should come to the Washington Square campus to associate with other graduate students and to avail themselves of the library facilities located there. In practice, neither goal was achieved since the added commuting time extended the women's stay away from home and caused them to hurry to trains or cars instead of going to the library. Classes were scheduled from ten in the morning until four in the afternoon and students seldom took advantage of the library facilities after four o'clock since they had a long commute with dinner and children awaiting them at home. Instead of associating with other graduate students at New York University, the Sarah Lawrence students were isolated from other graduate students who were on campus during the 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. day. Frequently separate sections of classes were scheduled for the Sarah Lawrence women so there was little opportunity for association with other students. In effect, then, the constraints of travel and scheduling had a detrimental rather than beneficial effect upon the attitudes and associations of the program participants.

Recruitment and Selection of Students

Although Sarah Lawrence and New York University worked jointly in the teacher-training program, Sarah Lawrence took full responsibility for the recruitment of students. The Center for Continuing Education publicized the programs it offered through brief articles in the local newspapers. Local PTA's were also contacted and advised about the program. When Sarah Lawrence and New York University were working closely with the Greenburgh 8 School District, items appeared regularly in the neighborhood newspapers. In addition, a representative spoke at a seminar dealing with Future Careers for Women, and Mrs. Rauschenbush wrote an article for Harper's Bazaar in 1965 which stimulated interest.

Most of the women, however, were recruited for the program through informal channels. They heard about the program from a friend who had been to the Center or was enrolled in another program. Others came to the Center seeking advisement about career opportunities and were directed to the New York University-Sarah Lawrence program for teachers. Active recruitment of groups outside the Westchester area was not attempted.

The Center for Continuing Education maintains a consultation service which provides educational information about graduate and undergraduate programs offered by the colleges and universities in the area. Women seeking to continue their education make the initial contact by phone and if they desire an interview, are sent a brochure (see Appendix E). After a few years of providing the services free of charge, a minimal fee of $10 was asked for consultation, including as many interviews as necessary. The initial interview is arranged after the candidate has filled out an information and interview request sheet. She is instructed to contact her college to have transcripts sent to the Center. When all the materials are in, an interview is arranged.

Although past grades are not the deciding factor in determining the ability of a candidate, the counselor is interested in knowing how the student functioned at 18 or 20. The interview is considered most important in determining the basic intellectual potential and motivation of the student. Many women come in knowing what they would like to do and if teaching is their ambition, the program at New York University is discussed. Sometimes a candidate is not sure of the area in which she would like to study and the counselor might suggest teaching. She would suggest that the applicant do some volunteer work with children first to see if she would enjoy this type of work. The counselor is very interested in the life history of the applicant after leaving college for this helps to decide what might be the best course for this person.

After a lengthy interview an application is given to the student who wishes one. A folder is kept for each counselee. The counselor writes up each interview in the following way: Description of the potential student, educational background, goals, choices and program, analysis which includes a summary and evaluation by the counselor and the action taken. Very little followup is done. The Sarah Lawrence staff

takes the responsibility for a number of stages in the processing of the candidate but New York University staff makes the final decision about acceptance. Until 1967, Sarah Lawrence staff saw all the candidates, then sent student papers and recommendations to New York University for final evaluation. Since 1967 Professor McLeod has interviewed all applicants to the New York University-Sarah Lawrence program. Previous to that time, this second interview had been bypassed.

New York University's selection is based on graduate school entrance requirements and state certification requirements. The program was devised primarily for liberal arts graduates with 90 credits of liberal arts, and applicants with a degree. New York University preferred students with a B average but would accept a C student after an adult admissions test. There was a limit to the number of students accepted for the program each year as it was designed to handle no more than 18 students.

From November 1967 to October 1968, 43 women interested in elementary education were interviewed. Nine women were accepted for the 1968 class. Some were admitted to other programs, others changed their minds about beginning at this time, and some decided to pursue other careers. A few did not meet the requirements and were encouraged to look elsewhere. Although "overselection" has been indicated the counselors feel this was an unfair criticism. They gave candidates opportunities to look at other programs which were more suitable.

Description of the Students

Nearly every group of graduates and participants of the New York University-Sarah Lawrence program has been characterized as a cohesive group of mature, intelligent women. They have been described by their instructors as "in the top 10% of all graduate students I've worked with, superior to other graduate students without previous teaching experience, superior in ability, drive, and social awareness, somewhat over-anxious with some inflexible individuals, intellectually superior, emotionally more mature, highly motivated, sometimes frightened and timid, possessing an enriched cultural background and a seriousness of purpose." Their clearly defined goal of wanting to become excellent elementary school teachers seemed to set their courses firmly and resulted in the willful intent to become that.

A number of factors contributed to the homogeneity of motivational types that appeared in the program; namely, the selection process, the population from which the participants were drawn, and the age range and and family experiences of the women. The counseling and selection process itself had the effect of narrowing the nature of the student body; i.e., only women who had a strong commitment to service and particularly teaching were encouraged to enroll in the teacher preparation program. Therefore, the bond of a common commitment unified their efforts toward these goals and made their pursuit of them similar.

TABLE I

Counselor Interviews

Period	Counselor I	Counselor II
Sept. 1966 - July, 1967	182	218
Sept. 1967 - July, 1968	180	215
Sept. 1968 - May, 1969	154	47
Total Interviews	516	480
Total interested in teaching	48	67
Total accepted in program	40	

The interviewed women were from Westchester primarily. Three were from New Jersey, 2 from Long Island, 7-New York City, 9-Connecticut, 2-Rockland County. The rest were from Westchester County.

During this time forty students were accepted into the NYU-SL teacher education program. All forty of the women accepted into the program were from Westchester County except two. One was from New Jersey and one was from New York City.

Table I shows the number of interviews conducted by two counselors at the Sarah Lawrence Center for Continuing Education. It can be seen in Table I that nearly one thousand interviews resulted in only forty students being enrolled in the NYU-SL teacher education program. This percentage (4%) approximates the proportion of interviewees to enrollees in all of the programs offered through the Center. It is apparent that large numbers of women avail themselves of the counseling service yet do not enroll in a program. Further evidence of the large number of contacts can be seen in Table II. Table III shows the number of women who have enrolled in each of the graduate programs through the Center for Continuing Education. It is evident that the SL Counseling Center processes large numbers of interviews to net the numbers enrolled in graduate professional programs.

TABLE II

Sarah Lawrence Center for Continuing Education
Interviewing and Counseling Service
1962-1968

Type of Contact	Number
Telephone inquiries and brochure mailings	7474
Personal interview - first round	3418
Personal interview - second round	298

TABLE III

Sarah Lawrence Center for Continuing Education
Distribution of Students in Graduate Programs

Program	Number
NYU Teacher Education	82
NYU School of Social Work	90
Pratt Library Science	51
Bank Street Counselor Education	45
City College Remedial Reading	15
Total number in all professional graduate programs	283

The commitment to elementary school teaching appealed to a particular type of Westchester woman. As evidenced in their self reports, they had made significant contributions through volunteer work and had participated widely in women's groups. Most of them believed that they could make a more significant contribution by improving their own skills and devoting a major portion of their time to one effort; namely teaching. The unique combination of commitment, background, and intellect caused these groups to differ noticeably from other groups of pre-service graduate students.

Cohesiveness in the groups was brought about not only by the similarity of background and purpose, but by the nature of the program as well. First, it required only part-time attendance which was a favorable feature for these women whose family responsibilities allowed only that. Secondly, the women were together in classes over a three year period and frequently were isolated from other groups at the Sarah Lawrence campus as well as at New York University. The first year of the program included a sizeable element of group dynamics in which students were trained in ways of working together effectively. Students frequently mentioned the leaders of these group sessions as ones responsible for the feelings of unanimity.

The population from which the students were drawn represents the upper-middle socioeconomic levels of many suburban communities. The women that sought out this particular route to a service role could be characterized as those having a commitment to social service, some special talent for relating to children, and the intellectual caliber required for graduate study. Furthermore, these women saw their locus of service as remaining in their own or neighboring communities where they and their families had roots. The program and the interests of the women, however, extended far beyond the confines of the parochial setting of the university, the college campus, and their local community.

Description of the Program

Although the program has changed each year since its inception, a general pattern of courses and experiences evolved for the early groups. Generally, the first year included courses in foundations of education, curriculum, child development, and field work experiences. The second year included courses in the teaching of language arts, math, social studies and science with related field work and the third year was devoted to student teaching, internships, and electives for individual needs.

Course Listings of New York University-Sarah Lawrence Teacher Education Program, 1963-1969

Group I

Year I - Semester I - 1963-64

E 10.2009 (5 pt.) Foundations in Education

Semester II

E 25.2309 (3 pt.) Childhood Education and the Curriculum
Curriculum evaluated in terms of how it contributes to children's growth, set in the context of new contributions in various fields of knowledge.

E 25.1171 (2 pt.) Child Development and the Program of Childhood Education
Basic concepts and principles of child development and their application to elementary education

Year II - Semester I - 1964-65

E 25.2365 (5 pt.) Field Experience I - Observation and Participation

Semester II

E 25.2366 (7 pt.) Field Experience - Internship

Year III - Semester I - 1965-66

E 25.1032 (2 pt.) Curriculum Activities in Mathematics in Childhood Education
Analysis of activities in the classroom that help children develop insight into mathematics both as a study in itself and as a tool for applied use. Various methods and approaches are explored together with the appropriate supporting research.

E 14.1001 (2 pt.) Science in Elementary Education
The purpose, selection, organization, and guidance of science experience suitable for children.

Optional E 25.1057 / E 85.1337 (2 pt.)

E 25.1057 (2 pt.) Creative Art Activities in the Elementary Classroom
Planning and organizing creative art work in the classroom, individual and group studio experience, observation and reading.

E 85.1337 (2 pt.) Curriculum Activities in Music
Singing, playing, moving, listening and creative experiences in music related to childhood development and education.

Semester II

E 25.1060 (3 pt.) Language Arts in Childhood Education
The relation of children's oral and written language, handwriting, spelling, reading, and literature to personal growth and curriculum of early childhood and elementary education.

E 25.1127 (2 pt.) Social Studies in Childhood Education

Year IV - Semesters I and II - Individual Course Work to complete Master of Arts in Education and certification requirements.

Optional — E 25.1057, E 85.1337 — Described Above

GROUP II

Year I - Semester I - 1964-65

E 10.2009 (5 pt.) Foundations of Education

Semester II

E 25.2021 (3 pt.) Child Development and the Program of Childhood Education (including principles of Elementary Education)
An advanced course for students with a basic knowledge of child development. Analysis of recent developments in theory and empirical knowledge about child development, with particular reference to their implications for children's growth in schools.

E 25.1071 (2 pt.) Foundations of Curriculum in Childhood Education II
Content and experiences in the various areas of the curriculum for nursery through the elementary school. Procedures for curriculum planning; variety of approaches meeting individual differences and cultural demands.

Year II - Semester I - 1965-66

E 25.2367 (3 pt.) Field Experiences - Observation - Experiences in Childhood Education

E 25.1032 (2 pt.) Math

E 14.1001 (2 pt.) Science

Optional { E 25.1057 (2 pt.) Art / E 85.1337 (2 pt.) Music

Semester II

E 25.2368 (3 pt.) Participation Experiences with Children Field Experience II - Participation

E 25.1060 (3 pt.) Language Arts

E 25.1127 (2 pt.) Social Studies

or

Options mentioned above

Year III

E 25.2366 (6 pt.) Field Experiences: Internship

GROUP III

Year I - Semester I - 1965-66

E 10.2009 (5 pt.) Foundations of Education

Semester II

E 25.2021 (3 pt.) Advanced Child Development

E 25.1071 (2 pt.) Foundations of Curriculum in Childhood Education

Year II - Semester I - 1966-67

E 25.2367 (3 pt.) Observation

E 25.1032 (2 pt.) Math

E 25.1001 (2 pt.) Science

Or Optional

E 25.1057 (2 pt.) Art

E 85.1337 (2 pt.) Music

Semester II

E 25.2368 (3 pt.) Participation. Spend 1 day a week in same classroom.

E 25.1060 (3 pt.) Language Arts

E 25.1127 (2 pt.) Social Studies

Or Optional

E 25.1057 (2 pt.) Art

E 85.1337 (2 pt.) Music

Year III Semester I 1967-68

E 25.2366 (6 pt.) Field Experiences: Internship

Group IV

Year I - Semester I - 1966-67

E 10.2009 (3 pt.) Foundations in Education

E 25.1171 (3 pt.) Child Development and the Program of Childhood Education

Semester II

E 25.1371 (2 pt.) Field Experiences: Observation

E 25.1071 (2 pt.) Foundations of Curriculum in Childhood Education

E 25.1127 (2 pt.) Social Studies in Childhood Education

Year II - Semester I - 1967-68

E 25.1060 (3 pt.) Language Arts in Childhood Education

E 14.1001 (2 pt.) Science in Childhood Education

E 25.1372 (2 pt.) Field Experiences: Participation I

Semester II

E 25.1032 (2 pt.) Curriculum Activities in Mathematics

E 25.1057 (2 pt.) Creative Art Activities in the Elementary Classroom

E 25.1373 (2 pt.) Field Experiences: Participation II

Year III - Semester I - 1968-69

E 25.2366 (6 pt.) Field Experiences: Internship

Semester II

Individual course work leading to degree and certification.

GROUP V

Year I - Semester I - 1967-68

E 10.2009 (3 pt.) Foundations in Education

E 25.2021 (3 pt.) Child Development and the Program of Childhood Education

Semester II

E 25.1371 (2 pt.) Field Experiences: Observation

E 25.1071 (2 pt.) Foundations of Curriculum in Childhood Education

E 25.1127 (2 pt.) Social Studies Program and Analytical Study of Teaching

Year II - Semester I - 1968-69

E 25.1060 (3 pt.) Language Arts

E 25.1372 (2 pt.) Field Experiences: Participation I

E 14.1001 (2 pt.) Science Program

Semester II

E 25.1032 (2 pt.) Math Program

E 25.1127 (2 pt.) Social Studies Program

E 25.1373 (2 pt.) Field Experiences: Participation II

Year III - Semester I - 1969-70

E 25.2366 (6 pt.) Field Experiences - Internship - 180 hours

Semester II

Complete individual course work

Group VI

Year I - Semester I - 1968-69

E 10.2009 (3 pt.) Foundations in Education

E 25.2021 (3 pt.) Child Development and the Program of Childhood Education

Semester II

E 25.1371 (2 pt.) Field Experiences: Observation

E 25.1071 (2 pt.) Foundations of Curriculum in Childhood Education

E 25.1127 (2 pt.) Social Studies Program and Analytical Study of Teaching

Various emphases, often prompted by student needs or staff interests, have been made at a variety of points throughout the program. Of the number of proposals made for changes in the program, some were adopted, some were impossible due to state certification requirements, and some were dropped because of lack of interest or staffing requirements. Perhaps the most exciting and unusual changes in the program came with the addition of the group dynamics sessions for the students' first year and the recent addition of the analytical study of teaching.

The group guidance sessions were intended to help the student re-orient herself to habits of study, to gain confidence in her ability to do scholarly work after an absence of several years from college, and to introduce her to the field of education. The sessions had the added effect of helping women relate to one another, identify areas of common interest, pursue a topic or project to a successful end and reduce the need for competition with her peers. This aspect of the program was lauded by all students who participated in it and should be retained in any future programs.

Students entering the program in the fall of 1967 were exposed to the outstanding experimental feature of the Sarah Lawrence-New York University

program, a course in the analytical study of teaching. The central purpose of the course was to enlarge the student's conceptual framework of teaching. Discussing the rationale for this course, the instructors said, "Unlike a number of other professions about which the novitiate has little first hand knowledge, everyone is familiar with teaching from having been the recipient of teaching over the years. Hence, the student brings his own particular and usually limited conceptual framework to the teaching situation."

Central to the analysis of teaching course was the analysis and study of teaching-learning models, the analysis and application of systems of verbal interaction, and the study of teaching strategies. Close involvement with the public schools and extensive use of the techniques learned in the analytical study of teaching in classrooms made this an application of theory course. The second dimension of the course was the use of simulation, video taping of teaching segments, development of films, audio tapes, and other uses of media. Students were able to develop teaching units, see themselves use the material, evaluate the video tape with immediate feedback from the instructors and propose different strategies for the teaching segment. This course replaced the curriculum foundations course and the introductory participation experiences. It was continued for the 1968 entrants and became a regular course offering for the NYU Division of Early Childhood and Elementary in the School of Education. This course is the one aspect of the SL program which has definitely had an effect on other programs for the preparation of teachers.

EVALUATION OF THE SARAH LAWRENCE-NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Procedures used in this study

The evaluation plan for the NYU-SL program was directed at three target areas that had been identified as having unique goals for the program. The question of the success of the program was asked from the vantage point of the institutions involved, the students participating, and the profession or society.

Interviews, questionnaires, examination of records, telephone interviews, and observation were the procedures used in collecting information for this report. In most instances, two or three interviews were held with key personnel until the evaluation team had identified several critical areas for shaping a questionnaire for the total population. In that sense, the evaluation process can be described as an evolving one. Student evaluations made at the end of each academic year were used as a source of information. (See Appendix A) In the development of a questionnaire for the student population, a trial questionnaire was developed, mailed to representative students, and returns were used as a guide for developing the final questions used. (See Appendix B for the pilot and final questionnaire for students.)

Broadly, the evaluation was an attempt to identify the goals that the program had been designed to achieve, to assess how well the results of the program indicated they had been achieved, and to make recommendations about future programs.

Interviews were held with Esther Rauschenbush, President of Sarah Lawrence; John Payne, Associate Dean of the School of Education of New York University; Alfred Ellison, Chairman of Early Childhood and Elementary Education of New York University; June McLeod, Director of Sarah Lawrence Program at New York University; Bert Lowenberg, Director of Center for Continuing Education; Joan Dumont, Counselor; Betty Strauss, Formerly Coordinator of Center; Lonnie Patt, Publicity; Ellie Seeger, Margot Ely, and Angela Jaggar, Instructors in the program.

Questionnaires were sent to all participating staff, (Appendix C) students, (Appendix B) and principals (Appendix D) involved in the program in any way. Principals who had employed graduates of the program were questioned, also. The following table indicates the percent of responses to questionnaires.

TABLE IV
Questionnaire Returns

Source	Percentage returning
Staff	97%
Students	49%
Principals	40%

Summary of responses by staff

The NYU staff members who worked with the SL students were ones who displayed an interest in the education of mature women, were enthusiastic about their area of competency and were regarded by their colleagues as excellent teachers. The level of enthusiasm for their work with the Sarah Lawrence-NYU students is suggested by the percentage of returns to the staff questionnaires. Ninety-seven percent of the staff responded to the questionnaire forms. The only person who did not reply has moved to another university.

How did the SL-NYU students compare with other groups of graduate students?

"Top 10% of all graduate students I've worked with"
"Very high personal goals"
"Superior in ability, drive, social awareness, experience with children, and insight"
"High in most areas, somewhat over-anxious, some inflexible"
"Superior, possessing a seriousness of purpose"
"Highly motivated, intellectually superior, emotionally mature"
"Exceptional, mature, dedicated, enthusiastic"

A sense of appreciation for the sincere interest and high motivation for becoming a teacher shown by the SL students is evident in the staff members' responses. The experiential background of the students seemed to inspire their instructors to explore diverse avenues and approaches to education. There was some recognition of inflexibility in students, but this was frequently qualified or limited to specific students. As a group, the women were characterized as intelligent, highly motivated, and superior.

Despite the fact that the staff members were enthusiastic about the students and their subject area, they saw many ways to improve the program offered. These were some of their recommendations for changes or improvements in the program.

"More creative program with relaxed certification requirements"
"Greater integration of field experience and theory courses"
"Greater emphasis on developing specific teaching skills"
"Study of teaching using conceptual models"
"More work on individualized instruction, self-study, seminars on fieldwork"
"Build sound understanding of curriculum content and child development"

By surveying the staff comments, it is evident that they were not totally satisfied with the existing program. A clue that they were suppressed by state certification requirements is seen in the first remark, but it is now evident that this stricture no longer exists.

Further evidence of the desire for restructuring the SL-NYU teacher education program is detected in the repeated comments about individualization, specification of behavioral objectives, assessment of individual strengths and weaknesses, programming students according to needs, and

self-pacing. Staff members associated with these students evidently recognized wide diversity in needs and strengths and resisted attempts to provide common or uniform types of experiences for them.

Another definite trend shown in the comments by the staff is the attempt to unify the field experiences with courses and the need for immediate feedback about field performance from university instructors. Several staff members suggest the use of video-tape techniques and feedback, university participation in the schools, application of learned teaching behaviors in a field setting with faculty guidance, and immediate feedback on field experiences. Both this cluster of improvements and the preceding ones for the individualization in programming are reflected in the plan for a Model Elementary Teacher Education Program recently developed by the NYU Division of Early Childhood and Elementary Education. The program described in the METEP incorporates many of the suggestions for improvement of the Sarah Lawrence-New York University teacher education program. In fact, several of the staff members suggested the METEP proposal as a description of improvements they desired in the SL-NYU program.

Summary of responses by students

TABLE V
Number of Students Responding to Questionnaire

Year of Entrance to Program	Total number of students	Number returning questionnaire
1963	13	6
1964	12	5
1965	17	7
1966	13	8
1967	18	9
1968	9	5
TOTALS	82	40
Percent of returns	49%	

Table V shows that nearly one half of the students from the SL-NYU program responded to the lengthy questionnaire sent to them. Due to the fact that they were enrolled in an exploratory program, the students had been asked for their evaluations several times prior to this request. (See Appendix A) Perhaps the frequent assessments in the past and the voluntary nature of this request accounted for the low 49% return. One person showed the exasperation of being asked to evaluate her experiences again and again in the space on the questionnaire provided for other comments. She wrote, "And could this please be the last time that I'm asked to evaluate my experiences in this program?"

TABLE VI
Number of Teachers Produced by the Program

Year	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Student Enrollment	13	12	17	13	18	9
Full Time	//	///	///	/		
Part Time	///	/	//	/		
Substituting	/	/		////	/	
* Related Activity			/	//	//	/

* serving on local school advisory committee

The students in years 1963, 64 and 1965 have completed their course. The students in years 1966, 67 and 1968 are still studying which accounts for the low number of tally marks for these years in Table VI.

The responses indicate that nearly all the women who have graduated from the program are teaching full-time, part-time or substituting. One woman plans to teach on the college level and one is not working due to a family illness. All the others plan to take on full-time teaching duties as soon as the age of their children allows. Those who are not teaching in the public schools are using the knowledge gained in some related activity.

The graduates of the NYU-SL program are teaching in their own or in neighboring communities. Pleasantville, Mamaroneck, Greenburgh, Harrison, Eastchester, Scarsdale, New Rochelle, Port Chester, White Plains and Yonkers are the districts in which these women have been employed. They are teaching in grades kindergarten to the sixth grade, teaching slow learners, working in remedial reading centers and one is working in a special education section. The diversity of their teaching assignments underscores the need for a flexible or individually prescribed program.

Question: What courses in your program were most helpful and why?

The students agreed that the field work, observation, participation and student teaching courses were the most valuable.

"Concrete supervised work with children is the most important method of learning how to teach."
"Related most to what teaching is"

The introductory courses taught during the first year of the program for each group were mentioned repeatedly as very necessary courses. The first year included a guidance and human relations dimension which was mentioned as extremely valuable for teachers-in-training.

"Valuable because of feelings instilled in us"
"Allowed the student a choice and voice in decision making which resulted in individual growth and meaningful learning"

Other courses mentioned consistently were methods courses in math, language arts and social studies. The 1967 and 1968 entrants lauded a new course called Analytic Study of Teaching because it attempted to present a well-rounded introduction to course content, problems and attitudes to be met in a classroom Students agreed that the value gained from a course depended on the caliber of the teacher. Courses that departed from the strict lecture approach and used group discussion and interaction were considered the most valuable.

Question: What courses were least helpful and why?

Foundations of education, child development, and methods courses were labeled as least helpful by many of the students who returned the questionnaire. Respondents called these courses irrelevant and redundant. They criticized the content and the teaching procedures as follows:

"Just lesson plans, not an application of them"
"Some instructors did not allow discussion and there was no conversation in a group that other teachers found impossible to shut up"

In addition many women mentioned that although the field work was the most valuable, they would have liked more involvement in the public school classroom by instructors and supervisors. They wanted the person who had suggested a particular approach to assess the implementation in addition to the classroom teacher's assessment.

Question: What courses would you like to see added and why?

A large component of field work was indicated by 90% of the women as the most valuable course to be added. The requests for more field work were paralleled with requests for increased supervision by the

NYU staff and full cooperation with the classroom teacher. Teaching and observation in carefully chosen classrooms with master teachers was mentioned as a valuable addition. A course which would demonstrate teaching strategies and provide a follow-up classroom application experience was described as an ideal way to learn. Feedback, discussion and criticism were considered very necessary aspects of a teacher training experience. One suggestion was for some kind of "master-teacher-apprentice relationship" with the master teacher closely supervising the progress of the apprentice teacher.

A complete and separate course in the teaching of reading was requested by 50% of the students. A course designed to show the students all of the available approaches to teaching reading and the problems of perception was considered to be necessary. The students requested thorough training in the teaching of reading and in coping with reading difficulties of children. They asked for practical methods of remediation and many felt they had been inadequately trained in this area.

Most students agreed that content in the curriculum areas was needed but that methods courses had to be redesigned. Some suggested consolidating methodologies into a workshop with a flexible teacher who would arrange for guest lecturers in the different areas in the curriculum. They insisted that they should be taught not only what to teach but how to teach. Several suggested that closer integration of their courses and their field work would have improved their program markedly.

Other respondents mentioned a need for a course in human relations or group dynamics to provide future teachers with an opportunity "to examine their behavioral responses, and to develop greater role flexibility." The ultimate purpose of such a course would be to help them provide children with an effective climate for learning.

Question: What types of instructors were most helpful and why?

The staff members who participated in the first year programs at SL were praised consistently by every group of students. The instructors were described as enthusiastic, understanding and superior teachers who created an accepting learning atmosphere. Students used adjectives such as aware, helpful, cooperative, and enthusiastic to characterize them. Emphasis was placed on the importance of the instructor as a determiner of a good course. "A good instructor could make any subject meaningful, exciting and relevant."

Students noted that it required a particular type of person to be an effective teacher of mature women. It was not enough for an instructor to be competent in his discipline, he must also be supportive and understanding. One of the teachers the students labeled helpful was described as "a real human being who had the kind of concern and interest that we were told teachers should have". Instructors who were available for counseling, discussed individual field work teaching

attempts, and helped plan teaching strategies were considered helpful.

Instructors who inspired students seemed to be ones whose personal qualities included acceptance and warmth. One person was cited for creating a good group feeling and "helping us keep our perspective when pressures became strong".

Below are some comments about specific teachers:

"He had some refreshing, novel ideas and was concerned with us and our potential as teachers."
"Her knowledge was broad, and she related our questions to current data."
"Gave excellent creative examples which I have used and found marvelous"
"She gave honest constructive criticism."
"She made you think, question, and read."

In summary, the SL students preferred teachers who were understanding as well as knowledgeable. The value of each course was determined largely by the quality of instruction in it.

Question: What types of instructors could have been more helpful?

Some instructors were described as rigid, inflexible, and authoritarian. Students were repelled by instructors who required regurgitation of information for marks, and accused these people of being guilty of the worst kind of teaching. Courses that stressed rote memory and did not include concrete or practical experiences were severely criticized by students. Their comments can be summarized by "I could have gotten as much from reading the book on my own."

Instructors who spent all their time lecturing were censured for not relating the information from their area to the classroom. Some courses were considered destructive rather than inspiring or enlightening. Instructors who spent time analyzing students instead of dealing with the subject area were criticized; some women said they were made to feel inferior by their instructor.

In summary, students again judged that each course was as good as the instructor. Apparently, mature women are severe in their criticism and have high expectation levels for teaching performance. This group of women insisted on relevant information, illustrations of application of information, time for individual problems and qualities of human kindness from their instructors.

Question: What problems did you face while participating in the program?

Students selected for this program were mature women with families who had been out of school for many years. Their adjustment to

homework, tests, reading and studying was most difficult at the beginning of the program. The women generally found their families cooperative and appreciative of their efforts. A few mentioned that at first they were dismayed at the thought of preparing research papers but felt great satisfaction from their accomplishments in this area. A few indicated problems in adjusting to a "double life", but indicated that after routines were worked out the entire family seemed to benefit from the mother's going to school. Some indicated that it was actually a great unifying force for everyone in the family wanted to help. Those with very young children found the adjustment most difficult.

Some women felt that they were too conscientious, concentrated too much and worried too much about their accomplishments. All agreed that as they continued in the program their feelings of inadequacy left and that the experience helped them tremendously.

Question: What were the advantages and disadvantages of holding classes at NYU campus or Mamaroneck and Sarah Lawrence campus?

Most of the women enrolled in the Sarah Lawrence-NYU program because it was close to home. Almost all resented the trip to NYU because it was expensive, time-consuming, boring, wasteful and an irritating experience. They felt that there was no advantage in traveling to NYU for they did not mix and meet with other students and they could not use the library facilities because of the time factor. They left for home immediately after class because children were waiting for them. It was inconvenient to travel to the city and they did not participate in school activities.

"Commuting to NYU consumed time and put a strain on household responsibilities."

"There was some feeling that being down at NYU would give us the feeling of being part of the university that would be meaningful, but it was not accomplished."

"I see no advantage in the trip to NYU, as mature women we no longer benefit much from exposure to a campus experience."

A few students favored the university atmosphere; however.

"I liked the stimulation of the University atmosphere. I enjoyed NYU and felt a more serious approach to teaching represented here."

Question: How has raising children helped you to understand the children in your classrooms?

Generally, the NYU-SL students believed that having children of their own made them better teachers. Their own family experiences made them aware of learning patterns and difficulties and made them more

sympathetic to individual differences. Many felt that this learning was far better than any books could offer. Raising children of their own made them more comfortable with children and able to talk to them at a level the children understood. One instructor told them that "they were one step ahead because they were mothers".

"It has helped me to understand that most children have problems, and that things are seldom what they seem."

"I have adjusted my levels of expectation for the children as well as myself."

"I am more aware and accepting of the differences between children than if I'd only read about them."

Question: What recommendations would you make for future programs?

Students who had participated in the program had valuable recommendations for changes in future programs. Their comments are as follows:

"Careful selection of teachers with whom student teachers are placed with a careful definition of the duties of the cooperating teacher is necessary."

"Close cooperation between course work and field work is needed."

"The program should deal more with the individual developing his talents and strengthening his weaknesses."

"There should be more observation and participation with coordinated experiences."

"More video tape experiences would be helpful."

"Sarah Lawrence faculty should be involved as visiting lecturers or guest speakers."

"The program should be designed without summer school being necessary or required courses scheduled late in the afternoon or evening. An all daytime program is best for mothers."

"In the field experience, students need sufficient opportunity to work with the class as a whole with the cooperating teacher offering suggestions and criticisms."

"Instead of methods, I would like to see demonstration teaching with follow up discussions. NYU should have a demonstration school for this purpose, then perhaps methodology would have some real meaning."

"Better library facilities are needed at NYU and at the Sarah Lawrence campus."

"Classes should be held in an elementary school. There everyone could try out similar lesson plans and come together to compare and discuss results. More intensive observations over a shorter time span would be valuable."

"Analysis of teaching through video taping should be pursued to the point of actual analysis of the student's work. Student teachers should analyze their own teaching behavior with an instructor as they view their videotapes."

Summary of responses by administrators

The reactions of the people who had conceived of the idea of a cooperative program between a small liberal arts college and a large urban university were mixed when they were asked to assess the success of the venture. They reminisced about the dreams they had envisioned for the program and compared them with the realities of the program as it evolved. Perhaps the outcome is predictable in that no program could have fulfilled all of the hopes that several different people had for it. Basically, the administrators recognized many accomplishments through the program and yet they aspired to some dimensions which were not achieved. Each administrator recognized that the program had served well the people who were enrolled in it. Their contacts with the students and with staff members had been close enough for them to accurately guage reactions to the program. A great sense of failure was voiced by each of the administrators involved in the conception and implementation of the program in that it had not fulfilled its experimental function. As the program was conceived, it was intended that it should be radical, unlike any program that had existed previously. It was to be the laboratory for experimentation in teacher education and the education of mature women. The unique qualifications of the potential student body were to be capitalized on and used to improve teaching staffs. Furthermore, new approaches to the education of teachers were to be tried so that successful pieces of the program could be translated into regular programs at NYU and at other graduate institutions. Although each administrator could cite specific instances in which this project was used in these ways, it evidently did not meet their expectation level in full measure.

The administrators generally agreed that the NYU-SL teacher education program had served its purpose in several ways. It has demonstrated that women like those enrolled in the program make good teachers, that they have high motivation for study and perform at a high level, and that they commit themselves fully even though they are enrolled part time. The program had recognized value to the public schools in the community in that they were involved in the teacher preparation process and had access to capable apprentice teachers to help in instruction. Furthermore, the value of the program at NYU and SL was recognized as an opportunity to work with a distinct group of students, to explore new approaches to teacher education, and to demonstrate the caliber of teacher that could be produced by such a program. The program was used as a laboratory for several new approaches to teacher education and some of the approaches have been incorporated into the regular program at NYU as well as at other institutions.

Summary of responses by principals

The number of replies to the principals' questionnaire is meager due to several factors. First, it was difficult to obtain the names of principals who were now employing the graduates of the program because the schools were spread throughout several districts. Second, many of the principals who had participated in the training program had moved on to other schools or other professional roles. Questionnaires were mailed to the principals who could be located and their replies are summarized below.

Would you characterize this group of trainees and graduates any differently from other groups?

"They bought maturity, firm purpose and parenthood."
"More mature, dedicated"
"Greater degree of maturity, interest in teaching, interest in individual child, greater teaching skill"

Principals who employed the graduates of the program or helped conduct the training sessions were favorably impressed by the caliber of the student body. However, one principal pointed out:

"Their concepts of teacher roles tend to be stabilized. They see children as they would like children to be.. not as they are.. It's a big generation gap and the mature student needs specialized training, not training for certification."

The principals indicated that the women in the program were mature and highly motivated. They rated them as above average in performance and indicated that the program was very worthwhile and should be continued. A few principals indicated the need to attract and actively recruit black women into the program.

Descriptions of other programs in the area

In 1962 there were very few institutions that offered a program similar to the one developed by Sarah Lawrence and New York University. Since that time a number of comparable programs have been initiated. One of the expressed goals for the NYU-SL program was that it should serve as a model for other institutions and that has been accomplished. Descriptions of three programs available to women in the area are described in Appendix G. These are the programs at Manhattanville College at Purchase, N.Y., The College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, N.Y., and Western Connecticut State College, Danbury, Connecticut. (See Appendix G)

Summary of Evaluation

In terms of the institutional goals, the NYU-SL program can be evaluated as having achieved partial success. Since it was an attempt to approach the preparation of elementary school teachers in a unique program, this was done only in some aspects of the program. The first year of the program appears to have met the criterion of uniqueness, it did attract a group of potential teachers from a previously untapped source and provided an appropriate education for women returning to study after a long absence. Also, the program demonstrated the feasibility of part-time programs for mature women which other institutions have adopted.

The program was most successful in meeting the goals expressed by the students. Every woman questioned reported that the program had been a valuable use of her time after the demands of child rearing had lessened, helped her remain intellectually alert, gave her an added dimension in her own life, and prepared her to contribute to the welfare of society through a worthwhile profession. These women have taken positions in a wide range of socioeconomic areas.

The societal goals as reflected through the teaching profession were met to some degree. Although large numbers of teachers were not produced by the program, those who graduated from the program were regarded to be superior teachers by most professional judges. Cooperation between the public schools and a university was demonstrated and a program planned and implemented jointly was found to be successful.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recruitment and Selection

1. The selection criteria for participants in the program should be widened. Attempts to attract women from lower socioeconomic levels and women from varying racial and ethnic groups will not succeed with the present selection criteria. Scholarship funds should be available to part-time students and used to make the program feasible.

2. The recruitment program should be broadened. Active and systematic publicity and advertising campaigns are crucial to the sustenance of a large student body. Local newspapers should carry articles regularly about the program. School personnel in the area should be contacted and a circular describing the program be distributed to all volunteers in the schools. This brochure should be distributed to all public libraries, women's clubs, PTA organizations, the Urban League, NAACP, and New Careers Programs so that women from other areas, socioeconomic levels and racial groups are informed and attracted to the program.

3. Speakers should be sent to community groups to describe the program and the need for women to become prepared to work in a school environment either part-time, full-time, and on a volunteer or paid basis. Tutors, aides, and helping teachers should be encouraged to continue their preparation through such programs. Radio and TV programs that have interviews and discussions should be asked to have participants discuss this program.

4. Direct mailing of brochures and notices should be conducted on a systematic schedule.

5. A person primarily responsible for publicity should be retained to supervise and conduct this program of contact with prospective candidates.

Future Programs

1. The existence of several competing programs in the area geared to the needs of the population identified as potential teachers has made it clear that the NYU-SL program could now be used to attempt other new approaches. The competing programs now provide the type of program once provided by NYU-SL. However, there continues to be a great need for superior teachers. It was demonstrated that the type of woman attracted by the program became a superior teacher. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that the program be continued using all methods of recruitment suggested in the previous section.

2. The students participating in the program are mature, self-directed

women. Repeatedly in the responses to the questionnaires, they asked for individually tailored programs. The Model Elementary Teacher Education Program developed at NYU incorporates the type of program needed for these women. The SL-NYU groups provide an excellent opportunity to experiment with this individually tailored approach based on competency and needs. Before the competency and needs of individuals can be assessed, performance objectives and learning sequences should be identified for each of the areas now represented in the program by course offerings. Students' skills should be assessed to determine their level of competence and individual programs designed to advance each person's level of competence.

3. Greater integration of theory or concepts of teaching with on-the-spot practice was requested by students, instructors, principals, and administrators. The women in this program are calling for a self adaptive kind of program. They want to learn in an operational setting, to have teaching strategies demonstrated in a school setting, to have a guided clinical experience. The use of micro teaching, computer assisted instruction, self applied programs are called for so that the student can get the aspect he needs as he progresses through the program.

4. In addition, it is recommended that a program be initiated which would follow the graduate teacher into her first job placement. This program would involve individual treatment of relevant problems and methods of solving them.

5. Based on comments by the students, continuation of the guidance and counseling facility at a local college is vital. This aspect of the NYU-SL program appears to be a unique strength and should be expanded. Greater flexibility about the requirements necessary to enter the program would provide the additional students needed to guarantee continuation of the program.

6. The prototype used in this program should be adopted for an undergraduate program to train other school personnel. This would make it possible to attract women from other socioeconomic groups who were not interested in the master's degree.

Appendix A

Evaluation Forms Completed
by Students in 1965, 1966, 1967

Evaluation of
Sarah Lawrence - NYU Program

Groups I & II

In what ways do you feel you have grown as an individual?

What professional experiences have you found most helpful?

What professional experiences have you found least helpful?

EVALUATION Group III

Objectives - (What you hoped to get from last year)

Outcomes -

Strong points of program -

Weak points of program -

Any suggestions?

Appendix B

Pilot and Final Questionnaires
for Students in NYU-SL Program

Pilot Questionnaire

1. Year entered into Sarah Lawrence-NYU program:

2. Are you now teaching? If so, where?

3. If you are not teaching, why not?

4. What were the program's strong points and weak points in each of these categories?

    a) Curriculum
    b) Location of classes
    c) Staff
    d) Integration of field work experience and courses
    e) Cost of program

5. What kinds of adjustments were expected of mature women in the professional preparation program?

6. In what ways did the program capitalize on the strengths of women who had reared families?

7. What sources (people, literature, experiences) were most helpful in making the adjustment from homemaker to the roles required for professional preparation for teaching?

8. What additional type of guidance, help in study techniques and use of resources might have been helpful if it had been provided?

9. What would attract new students into the program?

Final Questionnaire

1. What year did you enter the Sarah Lawrence program?

2. Are you now teaching? Full-time Part-time Substitute

   If so:

   Where?
   What grade level?

   If not:

   Why?
   Do you plan to teach in the future?
   Are you doing another kind of professional or volunteer work that makes use of your recent background in education? What?

3. What were the program's strong and weak points in each of these categories?

   Curriculum:

   a) What courses in your program were most helpful and why?
   b) What courses were least helpful and why?
   c) What courses would you like to see added and why?
   d) How would you feel about a more radical approach in the program to include independent study with periodic seminars, guest lectures, plus a heavy reliance on field work? Describe your preference.

   Staff:

   a) Which type of instructor was particularly helpful? Why?
   b) Which type of instructor could have been more helpful? How?

   Integration of field work experience and courses:

   a) Describe instances where you were able to try out ideas from courses in your field work.
   b) Did the courses use experiences from you field work? Explain.
   c) What improvements do you see if your course instructors had worked with you in your field work placement?

4. What problems did you face while participating in the program?

   a) Group relationships
   b) Tests

c) Homework
d) Inability to concentrate
e) Family adjustment
f) Other

5. What were the advantages and disadvantages of holding classes at NYU campus vs. Sarah Lawrence or Mamaroneck?

6. In what ways did the program capitalize on the strengths of women who had reared families?

   a) How has raising children helped you to understand the children in your classrooms?
   b) Do you feel the program capitalized on your experiences as a mother?

7. What additional type of guidance, help in study techniques and use of resources might have been helpful if it had been provided?

8. What would attract new students into the program?

   a) How did you first hear about the program?

9. How would you describe your class group? Cohesive? Competitive? Other?

   a) To what factors do you attribute this description? Explain.
   b) Would the absence of marks, using a pass-fail arrangement, add or detract from the cohesiveness of the group?

10. Describe one significant incident which illustrates an important aspect of the program that occurred during your study.

Other Comments:

Appendix C

Questionnaire for Staff of NYU-SL Program

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Division of Early Childhood
and Elementary Education

Dear staff member,

As you may know, an evaluation of the New York University - Sarah Lawrence teacher education program is underway. This evaluation has a twofold purpose: first to determine whether or not to continue the program, and then, if it is continued, what changes, if any, should be considered. Therefore, many of the questions directed to the staff are focused on events of the past while some seek ideas about future programs. Your answers to the questions we have listed, plus any individual observations or recommendations, will be very helpful in this evaluation process.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Bernice E. Cullinan and Zelda Ferber
Evaluation Staff

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAFF

I. How were you related to the S.L. program?

What years were you involved in the instructional program?

What orientation did you receive involving the goals and plans of the total S.L. program?

How often were staff planning meetings held?

Do you think communication between staff members was adequate?

What suggestions would you have for improving staff planning and coordination of the program?

II. How did S.L. students compare with other beginning graduate students? Consider the following: a) general fund of knowledge, b) cultural interests, c) knowledge of educational programs, d) knowledge of child growth and development, e) application of experience with own children to work with children in school, f) willingness to learn - ability to be flexible - adaptable - receptive to new ideas - willingness to experment, g) ability to perform at graduate level.

III. What adaptations in instructional procedures were you able to make due to the nature of the group with whom you were working, or because of the conditions under which you worked? What restrictions were imposed by these factors?

IV. Do you believe that these women will make a more significant contribution to the teaching profession than other groups that have gone through our regular program? Why? or why not?

V. Do you know any reasons for the drop in enrollment during the past year?

Is the program worth continuing?

How should it differ from the present program?

VI. a) How would you envision a program featuring a completely radical approach to teacher training?

b) What would be stressed?

c) What would it include?

VII. a) Would group guidance or group dynamics sessions be valuable to the group?

b) Were all members of the teaching staff from NYU or S.L.?

c) How could you have involved S.L. staff members at the beginning of the program or in the instructional phase for which you were responsible?

d) Were supervisors informed of specific class assignments to better facilitate observation of lessons? (example - following methods courses)

e) Do you believe that methods courses should be taught? If not, how should this material (information) be transmitted?

VIII. Would you characterize your student group as cohesive, competitive or other?

What attributed to this description?

How could this be improved?

Appendix D

Questionnaire for Principals
Associated with NYU-SL Program

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Division of Early Childhood
and Elementary Education

Dear school administrator,

In an attempt to evaluate several aspects of the Sarah Lawrence - New York University Teacher Education program, we are contacting school principals who were associated with the program. Some of you had Sarah Lawrence - New York University trainees in your buildings, some participated in planning or conducting the instructional program, and others have hired graduates of the program.

Would you please take time to respond to this brief questionnaire so that we can get your opinion about the program?

Yours truly,

Bernice E. Cullinan and Zelda Ferber
NYU-SL Evaluation Staff

Questionnaire to Principals

1. In what ways were you associated with the SL-NYU Teacher Education program?

2. Would you characterize this group of trainees or graduates any differently from other groups?

   In what ways?

3. If you have employed any graduates of this program, would you rate their performances as:

   ( ) Above Average ( ) Average ( ) Below Average

4. If you were connected with their training program, what suggestions would you make for the improvement of that program?

5. Do you believe that there are a number of mature women in the Westchester area who would be interested in a program of this type?

   If so, how could they be reached?

OTHER COMMENTS:

Appendix E

Follow-up Questionnaire sent by Center for Continuing Education

A. ABOUT CONTINUING YOUR FORMAL COLLEGE OR GRADUATE EDUCATION

I. Are you now enrolled in a college course for credit? Yes___ No___
If No, skip to Question II on page 3.
If Yes, please answer the following questions:

a) Where are you enrolled?

b) How did you decide on the college you selected?
(Check any one or combination):

1. Knew about it before the interview at the Center_____
2. Suggested in the interveiw_____
3. Talked with a knowledgeable friend(s)_____
4. Talked with someone in the field_____
5. Used catalogues in the Center or elsewhere_____
6. Sent for catalogue myself_____
7. Telephoned the College_____
8. Had interview at the College_____
9. Other (specify)_____

c) Did you investigate any other colleges or universities than the one you are now attending? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please list the names and using the numbers above indicate how you investigated.

d) 1. How many semester hours of credit have you completed since your interview at the center?
2. How many are you carrying now?

e) When did you enroll?

f) In what department?

g) What courses are you taking?

h) 1. Are you matriculated for a degree?
If Yes, what degree?
2. Do you expect to matriculate?
When?

i) Are you enrolled for a certificate?
If Yes, what certificate?

j) Are you classified as Freshman?___ Sophomore?___ Junior?___
Senior?___ Graduate?___ Special?___ Other?___ None?___

k) When do you expect to finish your degree or certification?_____

l) About how much is your course work costing this semester?
(Do not count books, travel, etc.) Amount per credit _____
Total amount for tuition, registration fees, etc._____
Is this about what you expected it would cost? Yes_____
More_____ Less_____

m) Have you had to get extra or different help in your home because of your studying at home, or being out to classes or elsewhere relating to your studies?
If Yes, how much?
What kind?

n) About how many hours do you study each week, on the average?_____

o) Do you find studying difficult?
Please comment:

p) Do you find classes satisfying? Yes___ No___ Neither___
Please comment:

q) Are you enrolled in your present program of studies for (check as many as apply)
enrichment of your present life_____
training for non-paying work_____
preparation for a paid position_____
Double-check the one which is most important to you now.

r) Do you expect to go on to (or continue with) graduate study beyond your present program? Yes___ No___ In what field?

II. If you are not now enrolled at a college:

Assuming that when you came to the Center you were considering continuing your college education:

a) Are you now planning or thinking about continuing?
Yes___ No___ Uncertain___

1. If Yes, what are your plans?
2. If No, what has made you reconsider and decide against it?
3. If Uncertain, what are the factors which are important to you for making a decision? Please say what your decision, one way or the other, will depend on.

B. ABOUT THE ADVICE YOU RECEIVED AT THE CENTER

I. Whether or not you are continuing your college education, did your interview at the Center help in a general way to clarify your thinking or planning? Yes___ No___ Hard to say___
If Yes, in what way?

II. Did you receive any specific advice that helped? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please state what it was.

III. Did you receive any specific advice that didn't work (or led you in the wrong direction)? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please state what it was:

IV. Did you receive any incorrect information? Yes___ No___
If Yes, what was it?

V. Did you get information and advice from other individuals or institutions which
a) helped your planning for what you are doing now? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please state what the information was, and what the source.

b) hindered your planning? Yes___ No___ If Yes, how?

C. ABOUT OTHER THINGS YOU MAY BE DOING OUTSIDE YOUR HOME

I. Are you now employed in a paying position outside your home?
Yes___ No___
If Yes: 1) What is your position?
2) Full time? Yes___ No___
3) Part time? Yes___ No___
What hours of the day?_____ How many days weekly?_____

II. Are you now engaged in any non-paying work outside your home?
Yes___ No___
If Yes, list the work you do and about how many hours per week you are giving to it.

Volunteer work	Approximate hours per week	Hours of the day

III. Are you now taking any non-credit courses or classes, or any vocational training courses? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please list:

Courses	Where	Hours of the day or evening

D. ABOUT YOURSELF

(Some of this information we have, but it will help us if you would answer these questions again here.)

I. College experience:

	Dates attended or degree granted
a) One year or less_____	_____
b) Two years (about 60 credits) ____	_____
Degree or certificate after 2 yrs.	Yes _____ No _____
c) Three years or more_____	_____
d) B.A. or B.S. degree_____	_____
e) B.A. plus graduate credits_____	_____
About how many grad. credits?_____	
f) Advanced degree. What?_____	_____

II. Marital status

Single_____ Widow_____

Married_____ Divorced or separated_____

III. Children: Yes___ No___
If Yes: Ages of your children now: _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

IV. Your age now: _____

V. (If married) What is your husband's occupation?_____
(If widowed or divorced or separated)
What was your husband's occupation?_____

VI. What is (was) your husband's education? Some college_____
No college_____ College degree_____ If so, what degree?_____

Two Last Questions:

Please answer whether or not you are continuing your education.

1. Are you pretty well satisfied with your program this year?

   Any comments:

2. Do you now have any specific plans for the next 5 to 10 years that have not been indicated in this questionnaire?

Signed_____

CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION STUDENTS ONLY

Did (Do) the Center Courses meet your needs and interests: Please check the appropriate choice.

	Yes	No	Partly	Not Applicable
Literature	___	___	___	___
History	___	___	___	___
Psychology	___	___	___	___
Art	___	___	___	___
Religion	___	___	___	___
Sociology	___	___	___	___
Science	___	___	___	___
Math	___	___	___	___
Philosophy	___	___	___	___

What do you feel your educational needs are now?
How much time do you spend per week in study? Less than 15 hours____
15-20 hours____ 20-30 hours____ More than 30 hours____

Attitudes toward your return to study. Please check the appropriate choice:

	Pleased	Mixed	Unhappy	Indifferent	Not Applicable
Children's attitude					
Husband's attitude					
Friends' attitude					

Was (is) there need for personal or family adjustment upon your return to study? Please check the appropriate choice.

Help i.e. Domestic, Babysitting, etc. more needed____ the same needed____
Assumption of responsibility by your children Increased____ Same____ Decreased____
Husband affected in major ways____ somewhat affected____ not affected____
Finances entailed definite sacrifice____ some help, parents, scholarship loans____ some minor adjustment____ no effect____

Comment on any of the above categories that you care to. We are especially interested in the impact (if any) your return to study has had on the way in which you live.

Have you any suggestions for improving the Center?
Any additional comment you care to make that might be helpful to this five year study?

_____
Signed (optional)

Appendix F

Publicity Releases from Sarah Lawrence Center for Continuing Education

Lonnie Patt
337-3240

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
JUNE 24, 1968

NEW TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED IN TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

Westchester women who are candidates for the Master's Degree in Early Childhood and Elementary Education through the New York University - Sarah Lawrence College professional program in teacher training have just completed an innovative course entitled "The Analytical Study of Teaching". This course sought to involve participants in studying aspects of teaching roles through simulation and actual experiences. It also emphasized group dynamics and the emotional aspects of teaching-learning.

The Murray Avenue Elementary School of the Mamaroneck Public Schools provided facilities, including a television studio, to the New York University faculty for the teaching of this program. In addition, class time was spent at Sarah Lawrence College and in focused visits to such centers as the Institute for Developmental Studies and the Foxland School in Bedford, New York (Dial Access System).

Systems of analyzing teaching, such as verbal interaction, the logic of teaching, children's thinking, non-verbal behavior and teacher questioning were introduced and practiced. At other times, students analyzed video-taped segments of actual teaching situations.

Media played an important role in the course. A large range of media was available, including still and motion picture cameras and tape recorders. Students used these media to focus on teaching. They took pictures and sound in classrooms and produced their own segments on teacher roles.

Interviews are now being held at the Center for Continuing Education at Sarah Lawrence College for the sixth group of students to start in the fall of 1968. Study is based on a background in the liberal arts; no previous study in professional education courses is required. Women who may wish to return to study to prepare for teaching in public elementary schools should contact the Center for Continuing Education at 914-337-3240.

Publicity Release from Sarah Lawrence Center
for Continuing Education and Community Studies

Lonite B. Patt
DE 7 - 0700

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
June, 1967

Ten of the women who will be graduating in June from the New York University - Sarah Lawrence College Masters program in Early Childhood and Elementary Education will be teaching in Westchester County.

This will be the second group to graduate from this experimental program which was started in the fall of 1963 at the Center for Continuing Education in cooperation with New York University. The program prepares students for participation in nursery programs such as Head Start as well as for teaching in kindergarten and grades one through six. Four of our graduating class are already working at the Mount Vernon Children's Academy: Mrs. Howard Harmon from Harrison, Mrs. Sanford Levine from Dobbs Ferry, Mrs. Robert Solotaire from Tarrytown and Mrs. Samuel Thompson from White Plains, who is also teaching at Greenburgh #8.

Eight of the ten women who will be teaching in Westchester have expressed a desire to work in disadvantaged schools. These new teachers are: Mrs. Howard Harmon of Harrison, Mrs. Sanford Levine of Dobbs Ferry, Mrs. Arthur Meyer of Harrison, Mrs. Rowland Post of Scarsdale, Mrs. Eric Salline of Croton-on-Hudson, Mrs. Samuel Thompson of White Plains, Mrs. Otto Wirtsig of Ossining and Mrs. William Gaillard of Rye.

An undergraduate background in liberal arts is necessary for this program but no previous study in professional education courses is required. This is a three year part-time program leading to the degree of Master of Science in Education. Classes are scheduled for the most part in Westchester during the regular public school day to fit the needs of returning students who have household and family responsibilities.

A new group of women begin study each fall and interviews are now being held at the Center for Continuing Education at Sarah Lawrence College for the class which starts in September of 1967. Further information can be obtained by calling the Center at 337-0700, extension 58.

Appendix G

OTHER PROGRAMS AVAILABLE IN WESTCHESTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Manhattanville College in Purchase, New York

Master of Arts in Teaching Program

The program is designed for prospective and beginning pre-school, elementary and secondary school teachers. The program leads to the MAT degree and permanent certification for teaching. It offers the option of internship teaching at a salary of approximately $3000 for two semesters.

The program may be undertaken on a full time basis extending over 15 months, or on a two to three year part time plan. The part time plan is identical in content but permits students with a family to carry a reduced academic program over four or six semesters in addition to one summer session.

Thirty-two credits of graduate course work is to be taken for the MAT degree. Tuition for the program is $60 a credit plus a fee of $140 per semester for the school supervision. Internship opportunities are available for qualified students in several schools near the college. Two interns are assigned to full time teaching positions during a school year, following an intensive school experience during the summer prior to the internship assignment. One intern teaches in the fall and receives $2500 while the other teaches in the spring. While the intern is not teaching she receives $500, takes 12 college credits and maintains contact two days a week with her team member.

The courses offered include four courses in psychology-sociology specialization, plus one elective in education, an orientation to teaching, school experience which is student teaching 5 mornings per week for 12 weeks, plus courses in methods in science, social studies, language arts and math.

Eligibility - Women candidates who hold a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university - and who satisfy Manhattanville's admission requirements.

The College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, New York

Master of Arts in Art Education

The program requires that the candidate complete 36 semester hours of graduate study in three areas: Studio Art, Art History, and Education.

Programs are designed to be completed by attending a June and Summer Session each year for three summers or attending 2 June sessions and one academic year, or by attending for two summers and completing part-time work during one academic year. Courses are scheduled during the morning, afternoon, and evening for the convenience of students.

Western Connecticut State College, Danbury, Connecticut

Since the 1959 Spring Semester W.C.St.C. (then Danbury State College) has sponsored the Cooperative Teacher Education with the Darien Public School System. In September 1968, the Westport Public School System requested that the program include their school system. The present plan is to alternate the beginning classes in Darien (odd-numbered years) and Westport (even-numbered years).

The teacher preparation program is designed to meet the needs of young women whose home responsibilities are such that they must prepare to teach over a fairly long period of time. Graduates of accredited liberal arts colleges are eligible to apply for admission.

The program consists of three year-long courses. The first is psychological foundations of education, dealing with the mental, emotional and social development of children. This includes principles of learning and modern learning theory.

The second course is methods and materials of teaching in the elementary school. This course is designed to develop understanding of the total program of the elementary school grades, K through 6. This includes a minimum of eight weeks in full-time student teaching and during the remainder of the year to spend one morning or afternoon in selected elementary school classrooms.

The third course is social and philosophical foundations of education. This course considers the role of the school as a social institution in the local and national community, the interaction between the school and other institutions, and the utilization by he school of the greater community. Students enrolled will spend a morning or afternoon a week in selected schools or related community agencies.

Courses begin in September and continue during the school year for a two and a half year program. Completion of the program meets Connecticut professional education requirements for state certification. The program meets the credit hour requirement for the Master of Science degree. To earn the MS degree students must complete the thesis requirement through courses in thesis research or in taking two non-thesis courses.

ERIC Clearinghouse
DEC 1 1969
on Adult Education